

This Page Is Inserted by IFW Operations
and is not a part of the Official Record

BEST AVAILABLE IMAGES

Defective images within this document are accurate representations of the original documents submitted by the applicant.

Defects in the images may include (but are not limited to):

- BLACK BORDERS
- TEXT CUT OFF AT TOP, BOTTOM OR SIDES
- FADED TEXT
- ILLEGIBLE TEXT
- SKEWED/SLANTED IMAGES
- COLORED PHOTOS
- BLACK OR VERY BLACK AND WHITE DARK PHOTOS
- GRAY SCALE DOCUMENTS

IMAGES ARE BEST AVAILABLE COPY.

**As rescanning documents *will not* correct images,
please do not report the images to the
Image Problem Mailbox.**



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/814,042	03/20/2001	Kevin E. Crawford	END920000058US1(13761)	3522

7590 05/20/2004

Richard L. Catania, Esq.
Scully, Scott, Murphy & Presser
400 Garden City Plaza
Garden City, NY 11530

EXAMINER

PAULA, CESAR B

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2178

DATE MAILED: 05/20/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/814,042

Applicant(s)

CRAWFORD ET AL.

Examiner

CESAR B PAULA

Art Unit

2178

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20 March 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-15 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-15 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 20 March 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 3/20/01 . 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to the application, and IDS filed on 3/20/2001.

This action is made Non-Final.

2. Claims 1-15 are pending in the case. Claims 1, 6, and 11 are independent claims.

Information Disclosure Statement

3. The information disclosure statement (IDS) submitted on 3/20/2001 has been entered, and considered by the examiner.

Specification

4. The abstract of the disclosure is objected to because it contains legal phraseology—"comprises", and "comprise" in lines 6, and 12 respectively-- which is not permitted in the abstract. Correction is required. See MPEP § 608.01(b).

Drawings

5. The drawings filed on 3/20/2001 have been approved by the examiner.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

6. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

Art Unit: 2178

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

7. Claims 1, 4, 6, 9, 11, and 14 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Kanevsky (Pat.# 6,300,947 B1, 10/9/2001, filed 7/6/1998).

Regarding independent claim 1, Kanevsky discloses a client web browser URL request of a web page(s)—*web content file* containing web data-- from a server (col.4, lines 64-66, col. 6, lines 7-67).

Moreover, Kanevsky teaches the adaptation of web pages by stripping objects from the web page if the client's display size is small (col.7, lines 25-67, col. 9, lines 30-col.10, line 67, fig. 1, 6). In other words, if the web page is larger than the display size, then certain objects in the web page(s) are stripped or deleted in order to reduce the size of the web page and make it fit in the display, before displaying it in the client.

Furthermore, Kanevsky teaches the sending of the adapted or transformed web page—*downloading to the browser the reduced size file* less the stripped objects-- to the requesting web browser client for display (col.7, lines 42-67, figs. 1, 6-7, 15).

Regarding claim 4, which depends on claim 1, Kanevsky teaches the transformation of the web page to make it fit in a smaller window by dropping or deleting one of two horizontal lines—*consolidating into one logic blocks* of markup language representing the lines-- represented by HTML tags—*shortening recurring identifiers* or tags--, which is not needed,

Art Unit: 2178

because it is just serving a decorative purpose, and does not perform a vital function—
downloading to the browser the reduced size file-- to the web browser client for display (col.7,
lines 42-67, figs. 1, 6-7, 15).

Claims 6, and 9 are directed towards a computer system for implementing the steps found
in claims 1, and 4 respectively, and therefore are similarly rejected.

Claims 11, and 14 are directed towards a program storage device for storing the steps
found in claims 1, and 4 respectively, and therefore are similarly rejected.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all
obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

9. Claims 2-3, 7-8, and 12-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable
over Kanevsky, in view of "Laura Lemay's Web Workshop JavaScript", Lemay et al,
hereinafter Lemay, Sams.net, 1996, pp.219-229.

Art Unit: 2178

Regarding claim 2, which depends on claim 1, Kanevsky teaches the transformation of the web page to make it fit in a smaller window by dropping or deleting decorative objects from the web page, such as icons, and graphic images (col.7, lines 30-67, col.9, lines 30-67, col.10, lines 36-46, 52-67, figs. 6-7, 15). Kanevsky fails to explicitly teach *removing comments and unused logic blocks from the file*. However, Lemay teaches the use of Javascript functions and comments (using “//” marks) for rotating advertisement banners, which are annoying to some users (page 227, line 10-page 229, line 9, list. 12.4). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Kanevsky, and Lemay, because Kanevsky teaches the benefit of stripping off decorative or unneeded objects from a web page to make it fit within a small display device (such as palmtops, and web phones), thereby, displaying as much of the web page as possible without straining the limited resources of the small device using decorative objects, such as advertisement banners.

Regarding claim 3, which depends on claim 2, Kanevsky teaches the transformation of the web page to make it fit in a smaller window by dropping or deleting decorative objects from the web page, such as icons, and graphic images (col.7, lines 30-67, col.9, lines 30-67, col.10, lines 36-46, 52-67, figs. 6-7, 15). Kanevsky fails to explicitly teach *the unused logic blocks are functions that are in the file but not used*. However, Lemay teaches the use of Javascript functions and comments (using “//” marks) for rotating advertisement banners, which are annoying to some users (page 227, line 10-page 229, line 9, list. 12.4). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Kanevsky, and Lemay, because Kanevsky teaches the benefit of stripping off decorative or unneeded objects

Art Unit: 2178

from a web page to make it fit within a small display device (such as palmtops, and web phones), thereby, displaying as much of the web page as possible without straining the limited resources of the small device using decorative objects, such as advertisement banners, which *cannot be used* in the small client since they would take up most of the display and memory resources.

Claims 7-8 are directed towards a computer system for implementing the steps found in claims 2-3 respectively, and therefore are similarly rejected.

Claims 12-13 are directed towards a program storage device for storing the steps found in claims 2-3 respectively, and therefore are similarly rejected.

10. Claims 5, 10, and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kanevsky, in view of Ross (Pat.# 6,163,780, 12/19/2000).

Regarding claim 5, which depends on claim 4, Kanevsky teaches the transformation of the web page to make it fit in a smaller window by dropping or deleting one of two horizontal lines—*consolidating into one logic blocks* of markup language representing the lines--represented by HTML tags which is not needed, because it is just serving a decorative purpose, and does not perform a vital function to the web browser client for display (col.7, lines 42-67, figs. 1, 6-7, 15). Kanevsky fails to explicitly teach *the consolidating step includes the step of identifying duplicated functions and replacing the duplicated functions with a reference to a single function in a library*. However, Ross teaches reducing the size or condensing of JAVA

Art Unit: 2178

code by replacing each method or function in the code with a reference to the location to that method within a sorted class list—*single function in a library* (col.2, lines 9-11, 29-41, 54-67, col.3, lines 8-26). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Kanevsky, and Ross, because the benefit of compressing computer code so as to remove unnecessary code and data to shorten access, and execution times (col.1, lines 48-col.2, line 26). This in turn would lessen the load on the limited resources of the small device such as the one taught above by Kanevsky.

Claim 10 is directed towards a computer system for implementing the steps found in claim 5, and therefore is similarly rejected.

Claim 15 directed towards a program storage device for storing the steps found in claim 5, and therefore is similarly rejected.

Conclusion

I. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Pepe et al. (Pat. # 5,673,322), Hill et al. (Pat. # 6,023,714), Murashita et al. (Pat. # 5,854,597, and 6,330,574), and Bodin et al. (Pat. # 6,311,223).

II. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Cesar B. Paula whose telephone number is (703) 306-5543. The

Art Unit: 2178

examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 8:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m. (EST).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Heather Herndon, can be reached on (703) 308-5186. However, in such a case, please allow at least one business day.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

Any response to this Action should be mailed to:

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Or faxed to:

- (703) 703-872-9306, (for all Formal communications intended for entry)

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington, VA, Sixth Floor (Receptionist).



CESAR B PAULA
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2178

5/19/04